IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO CIVIL ACTION NO.: C-1-03-548

LEROY E. EUVRARD, JR.

HON. SANDRA S. BECKWITH

Plaintiff

•

CITIBANK, THE TRAVELERS BANK, CSC

CREDIT SERVICES, EQUIFAX,
TRANSUNION AND EXPERIAN

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT, CITIBANK (SOUTH DAKOTA), N.A. (INCORRECTLY

NAMED IN THE COMPLAINT AS CITIBANK, THE TRAVELERS BANK), SUCCESSOR TO

Defendants : TRAVELERS BANK BY MERGER

Comes now the Defendant Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. (incorrectly named in the Complaint as Citibank, The Travelers Bank), successor to Travelers Bank by merger, by and through Counsel and for its Answer to the Complaint filed herein states as follows:

#### ANSWER

- 1. Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint relating to Plaintiff LeRoy E. Euvrard, Jr.; however, Defendant asserts that the address for Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. (incorrectly named in the Complaint as Citibank, The Travelers Bank), successor to Travelers Bank by merger, is Citibank (South Dakota), N.A., 701 E. 60<sup>th</sup> Street, N., Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57104-0432. Further Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge with regard to Defendants, Equifax and Experian, in subsections (d) and (e).
- 2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.
- 3. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

- 4. Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint as to notice to Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. (incorrectly named in the Complaint as Citibank, The Travelers Bank), successor to Travelers Bank by merger, (South Dakota), N.A.; however, Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 5. Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Complaint as to notice to Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. (incorrectly named in the Complaint as Citibank, The Travelers Bank), successor to Travelers Bank, by merger; however, Defendant denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 6. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 7. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 8. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 9. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 10. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 11. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.

- 12. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint for lack of knowledge.
- 13. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
- 14. Defendant denies the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

## FIRST DEFENSE

This answering Defendant states that the Complaint fails to state a claim against them upon which relief can be granted and should be dismissed.

## **SECOND DEFENSE**

That all or part of the claims of Plaintiffs set forth in the Complaint are barred by virtue of the expiration of the applicable Statute(s) of Limitations pertaining thereto.

## THIRD DEFENSE

That any alleged losses or damages sustained by Plaintiff, if any, are the direct and proximate result of the sole and/or contributory negligence of said Plaintiff.

## **FOURTH DEFENSE**

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of estoppel.

# **FIFTH DEFENSE**

Defendant affirmatively states and alleges that Plaintiff has failed to mitigate his alleged damages.

## **SIXTH DEFENSE**

The claims in Plaintiff's Complaint are barred or reduced because of superseding/intervening causes.

### **SEVENTH DEFENSE**

Defendant affirmatively states and alleges that Plaintiff's claims may be barred by additional defenses that may arise during the course of this litigation, and Defendant hereby expressly reserves its right to assert same and otherwise amend this pleading.

# **EIGHTH DEFENSE**

Defendant fully complied with its requirements under the Fair Credit Billing Act and Plaintiff did not fulfill his requirements to comply with said Act.

WHEREFORE, Defendant pray as follows:

- 1. That the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice at the cost of the Plaintiff;
- 2. For its costs herein expended, including reasonable attorney fees;
- 3. For trial by jury; and
- 4. For any and all other such relief to which Defendant may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Wm. T. Robinson III

Wm. T. Robinson III
Andrew J. (A.J.) Schaeffer
Greenebaum Doll & McDonald PLLC
50 East RiverCenter Blvd., Suite 1800 (Zip: 41011)
P. O. Box 2673
Covington, Kentucky 41012-2673
Office No.: (850) 655, 4200

Office No.: (859) 655-4200 Facsimile: (859) 655-4239

Counsel for Defendant Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. (incorrectly named in the Complaint as Citibank, The Travelers Bank), successor to Travelers Bank, by merger (South Dakota), N.A., and Travelers Bank

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Leave to File Responsive Pleading Out of Time was served on Counsel of record as set forth below this 20<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2003:

LeRoy E. Euvrard Jr., Esq. 2230 Burnet Avenue Cincinnati, Ohio Plaintiff

Pierre H. Bergeron, Esq.
Squire Sanders & Dempsey
Suite 3500
312 Walnut Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Counsel for Defendant Trans Union

Brian S. Kenworthy, Esq. Katz & Korin PC Suite 1120 Market Tower 10 West Market Street Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 Counsel for Defendant Trans Union

Alycia N. Broz, Esq.
Jones Day Reavis & Pogue
Suite 1900
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Counsel for Defendant Experian

Jason Mather, Esq.
Jones Day Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue E
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1190
Counsel for Defendant Experian

Rachel E. (Hansen) Burke, Esq. Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur Suite 2200 250 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Counsel for Defendant Equifax

John Friedline Esq.
Kilpatrick & Stockton LLP
Suite 2800
1100 Peachtree St. NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Counsel for Defendant Equifax

Raymond William Lembke, Esq.
Taft Stettinius & Hollister
Suite 1800
425 Walnut Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3957
Counsel for Defendant CSC Credit Services

s/Wm. T. Robinson III
Wm. T. Robinson III

COV:563430.1